UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ERNESTINE WELCH,

Plaintiff,

VS.

1:19-CV-846

BIO-REFERENCE LABORTORIES, INC.,

Defendant.

Transcript of a Video Status Conference held on February 16, 2021, the HONORABLE DANIEL J. STEWART, United States Magistrate Judge, Presiding.

APPEARANCES

(By Video)

For Plaintiff:

PATRICK SORSBY, ESQ.

Attorney at Law

1568 Central Avenue, 1st Floor

Albany, New York 12205

For Defendant:

FAEGRE, DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH, LLP

Attorneys at Law 600 Campus Drive

Florham Park, New Jersey 07932 BY: WILLIAM HORWITZ, ESQ.

Also Present: PLAINTIFF ERNESTINE WELCH

Jodi L. Hibbard, RPR, CSR, CRR Official United States Court Reporter 100 South Clinton Street Syracuse, New York 13261-7367 (315) 234-8547

(All present by Teams Video, 11:01 a.m.) 1 2 THE CLERK: We are now on the record, Tuesday, 3 February 16th, 2021, 11:01 a.m. The case is Ernestine Welch versus Bio-Reference Laboratories, Inc., Case Number 4 19-CV-846. Beginning with plaintiff, please state your appearances for the record. 6 7 THE PLAINTIFF: My name is Ernestine Welch. THE CLERK: Okay. And Counsel? 8 9 MR. SORSBY: Attorney Patrick Sorsby. 10 MR. HORWITZ: Good morning, this is William Horwitz 11 of Faegre, Drinker, Biddle & Reath on behalf of defendant 12 Bio-Reference Laboratories, Inc. 13 THE COURT: Okay, all right, well, good morning, 14 everyone, we're here on the record in this Teams call. 15 Ernestine, are you able to see me at all, are you just 16 dialing in by phone? 17 THE PLAINTIFF: I'm dialing in by phone, I'm able 18 to see you, though, you're not able to see me at all. 19 THE COURT: I cannot see you but I can hear you 20 crystal clear so for what I'm doing, that's good enough. 21 Just bear in mind that we do have a court reporter who's on 2.2 the line so I just tell everybody to make sure that 23 everyone's finished before they start speaking, that way we 24 don't have multiple people speaking at once. 2.5 So for the purposes of this conference this morning

2.2

2.5

is that after this matter was settled, I received a letter from plaintiff Ernestine Welch with regard to certain withholdings that were taken out of her check that reduced the check substantially and she had a concern with regard to that.

In the interim, Judge Sannes, who's the District Court judge on this matter, approved the settlement and the matter was resolved, but Judge Sannes has indicated to me that she wanted me to hold this conference to further clarify or explain, if necessary, exactly what went on.

So Ms. Welch, let me just start with you if I might. I read your letter that you sent to me and I appreciate it. I understand obviously you had an expectation as to what the amount was going to be, it was substantially less because there were numerous withholdings that were taken. Is it my understanding, would I be correct that nevertheless, you did in fact cash the check, is that right?

THE COURT: Okay. And I know that your counsel Mr. Sorsby also received a separate amount for his fees and that's been cashed as well, and then there was also -- we went over some issues at the conference that I held, and I did reach back and ask the court reporter to provide me a transcript of that proceeding just so I was sure that we discussed this issue, and so I was provided with a copy of

Yes.

THE PLAINTIFF:

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

4

that. And Mr. Horwitz during that conference indicated that Bio-Reference agrees to pay Ms. Welch the specific amount of the settlement in a gross amount of \$18,000, it will be less withholding as W-2 wages, and some portion of that, which Mr. Sorsby can let me know, will go toward attorney's fees. So this issue was discussed at the conference. Ms. Welch, what is it that you wish me to do at this point in time? THE PLAINTIFF: Well, it was -- it was never my understanding that it would be under severance pay, it was never written out in the settlement agreement and it wasn't spelled out in the hearing that I'm aware of that it was gonna go under severance pay, and severance pay to me is based on years of service, age, and the title of your job, so therefore, I don't feel like I received severance pay, and the tax bracket for this lump sum under severance pay, I was never given the opportunity on the taxes of whether, how I wanted that to be split up and wasn't aware of how the breakdown was for the severance pay. THE COURT: Okay. Have you filed your taxes yet this year? THE PLAINTIFF: They are in the hands of -- I am in the process of doing that, yes. THE COURT: Okay. I mean, I don't know whether or not -- don't get me wrong, I'm not giving tax advice to anyone here, but you know, as far as if you feel that you're

2.5

entitled to a refund, you should talk to your accountant or your tax preparer with regard to that particular issue. But your claim was always one that I understood and I believe the way the defendants understood as that of lost wages, that you were prevented from working at the facility you feel improperly, so it was a lost wage claim. And in any case that I'm involved in, that involves lost wages, separate and apart from say like a physical injury which would not be taxable, any settlement in that case is going to be taxable. So your responsibility to pay taxes is specific, it's nothing I can do anything about and it's nothing the defendants can do anything about.

THE PLAINTIFF: Right, and I totally understand that, I was aware that I had to pay taxes on it. I just thought that I was going to get the amount that I was entitled to and a tax form where I would file my taxes all together. I wasn't aware of the breakdown that was gonna happen and that it would be under severance pay because that was not written out or told to me at any point, in the settlement agreement or through my attorney. It was just based on less applicable, I was never told what it was going to be less applicable for.

THE COURT: Mr. Horwitz, just for the record, you want to just respond?

MR. HORWITZ: Um, I mean, your Honor, it was as

2.5

your Honor indicated, it was mentioned during the settlement conference that it would be less applicable withholding, the -- she's already deposited the money or cashed the check. The settlement agreement indicated twice that the payment was going to be less applicable withholding, she had 21 days to review the settlement agreement before signing it, she signed the agreement, the agreement contained all sorts of protections to make sure where she confirmed she carefully read and understood its terms, which would mean that she understood that it was subject to withholding.

It sounds like she's more raising an issue about how much withholding there was, which I'm also not -- I'm not a tax lawyer, so I'm not sure how that works, but it's clear from the pay stub that it was -- the money that was taken out was taken out for taxes, and as your Honor indicated -- well, at least my understanding is is that to the extent that she overpaid on her taxes, she should be getting a refund. And I'm not sure that would have been any different if -- had she gotten this payment without taxes and she then had to pay the taxes separately, I'm not sure the numbers would have come out any differently, but I do know that the company paid her the way it was legally obligated to pay her. And she in fact filled out a W-4 form in connection with the settlement that said employee's withholding certificate, complete W-4 so that your employer can withhold the correct federal income tax

from your pay.

2.2

2.5

So she clearly knew and, you know, it's unfortunate that she feels the way that she feels but we did comply with the agreement as it was worked out in court and amended to paper.

THE PLAINTIFF: Well, I didn't know it was going to be severance pay, that's my issue, nobody told me it was going to be filed under severance pay. And as far as settlement lump sum, there is a tax bracket where it's, you know, 10,000 -- 10 percent, 20 percent, 30 percent, what percentage was that taken out? Because that was way over 30 percent.

THE COURT: So it's really, Ernestine, just so I'm clear, it looks to be, so what you're saying is, you know, I mean obviously you're not happy but you understand that taxes are inevitably your responsibility, you --

THE PLAINTIFF: Yes.

THE COURT: You just think it was taken out obviously --

THE PLAINTIFF: Severance pay, under severance pay.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off. So you're saying because it was referenced as severance pay, whatever that might mean, it was at a higher withholding rate than if it were just wages, is that correct?

THE PLAINTIFF: Right.

2.2

2.5

THE COURT: And have you -- so really that becomes an issue of you filing, requesting a refund from the federal government, I mean they're the ones that have your money at this point in time.

THE PLAINTIFF: Well, my thing is if it wasn't written in the contract that it was severance pay, I mean I was never aware that it was gonna be under severance pay and if it was under severance pay then I was supposed to be contacted of how I would like those taxes to be taken out. And I should have had a right to be, you know, for the taxes to go over in my retirement plan or something like that, that I wouldn't get taxed so hard. I was not aware of that.

Mr. Sorsby sent me the W-2 forms and told me to fill out those forms -- or W-4, which one it is, in regards to filling those forms out and getting them back to me as soon as possible, that payroll needed these forms to cut the checks. So I thought if I didn't fill out the form, the checks wouldn't get cut. I wasn't aware of the tax liability that I was gonna be against at this point.

THE COURT: Well, what was your anticipation as to the amount of money that would be withheld?

THE PLAINTIFF: 2800, 20 percent.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, it -- I will consider this issue further but it seems to me that the fact of the withholding was explained at the settlement

conference.

2.5

THE PLAINTIFF: As less applicable, it wasn't explained as severance pay, it wasn't explained what they was going to file it under.

THE COURT: No, I understand what you're saying as far as the withholding, just saying the issue of the withholding and that these were wages was explained at the conference and it was also included in the settlement agreement. The settlement agreement was signed, the checks have been cashed, insofar as there was a withholding that was more than should have been withheld, the remedy in that case would be to file for a refund.

Mr. Sorsby, do you have anything you want to add at this point in time?

MR. SORSBY: I think that Ms. Welch has already indicated she understands that taxes are to be paid and she's liable for that and she seems to indicate she understands that taxes would be withheld. I think her issue is that, and I'm not an accountant just like everybody else here, I think she's concerned, and I don't want to speak for her, she can elaborate, that the way the stub reads as a severance, it says severance instead of a settlement, I think maybe perhaps her concern is that, does that change the ultimate tax liability in a negative way because of the way it's characterized.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

I will say in reading the case law in the tax court, in regards to settlements involving discrimination cases like this, the tax court is not very generous in recharacterizing how settlements are considered. consider a good portion of the settlement as wages, and if a settlement tries to get cute and characterizes it as something other than wages, at least the majority of it, they will recharacterize it and the plaintiff will face severe consequences. So I don't know if characterizing the check that she received as a severance has a negative tax implication, but she is correct in that it did not say that in the settlement agreement. But it might mean nothing. don't know if just putting that on a pay stub has any significance. I don't know. I'm not an accountant, so that's my -- that's the only concern that I can see that Ms. Welch is presenting here today.

THE COURT: Okay. And Ms. Welch, you haven't heard back from your tax advisor, your accountant, with regard to if you're entitled to a refund because of the withholdings, correct?

THE PLAINTIFF: Correct.

THE COURT: So it may be a nonissue. But it seems to me, and my understanding and my determination would be that there was an agreement in place to appropriately settle the case, and you know, insofar as there has allegedly been a

2.2

2.5

breach of the agreement, that's a separate matter, it's not necessarily before the court, but I will review

Ms. Ernestine's argument here and make a recommendation to

Judge Sannes since she's the District Court judge and the one who's in fact closed out the case.

Ms. Welch, is there anything further you want to tell me about while we're all together on this conference?

THE PLAINTIFF: No, Mr. Sorsby's spelled it out exactly my thoughts of the case. It wasn't, I wasn't aware of it was going to be settled under severance pay and that I was gonna be hit with that liability, the tax liability that I was, and I think that if it was under wages or something else, maybe I wouldn't have that huge tax liability. That was not spelled out to me and that's my argument.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. All right, Mr. Horwitz, anything further before we end?

MR. HORWITZ: Just very quickly, your Honor. And so I understand that Ms. Welch is referring to the word on the earning statement she got with her settlement payment, it says severance. That was, for whatever reason some person internally at the company indicated severance, but I'm not aware of any reason why that would -- why the tax liability would be different. That being said, to the extent she explains to her tax advisor that this was wages, this should be taxed at the rate of wages, I don't think there's going to

be -- there shouldn't be any problem. Certainly if we 1 2 were -- if the company or I were ever contacted, we would of 3 course take the position that this was exactly what everybody seems to agree that it was, which was wages. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. THE PLAINTIFF: Well, because it was -- I'm sorry, 6 7 because it was under severance pay and it was the end of the 8 year, it was considered my yearly income, and that's why 9 there was a large tax liability on it. 10 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, let me 11 consider this further, I'll issue either a written order or a 12 text order with regard to that but I appreciate everyone 13 coming on and explaining to me this more fully, all right? 14 THE PLAINTIFF: Okay, thank you. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. 16 MR. HORWITZ: Thank you, your Honor. 17 MR. SORSBY: Thank you, your Honor. 18 (Proceedings Adjourned, 11:17 a.m.) 19 20 21 2.2 23 24 2.5

1 2 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER 3 4 5 I, JODI L. HIBBARD, RPR, CRR, CSR, Federal Official Realtime Court Reporter, in and for the 6 United States District Court for the Northern 7 District of New York, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that 8 9 pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States 10 Code, that the foregoing is a true and correct 11 transcript of the stenographically reported 12 proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and 13 that the transcript page format is in conformance 14 with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of 15 the United States. 16 17 Dated this 10th day of March, 2021. 18 19 20 /S/ JODI L. HIBBARD 21 JODI L. HIBBARD, RPR, CRR, CSR Official U.S. Court Reporter 2.2 23 24

2.5